

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA

County of San Diego

DATE: April 14, 2006 DEPT. 71 REPORTER A: CSR#
PRESENT HON. RONALD S. PRAGER REPORTER B: CSR#
JUDGE

CLERK: K. Sandoval

BAILIFF: REPORTER'S ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 120128
SAN DIEGO, CA 92112-4104

**JUDICIAL COUNSEL
COORDINATION PROCEEDINGS
NO. JCCP 4221
1,11,111, AND 1V**

**TITLE [Rule 1550(b)]
NATURAL GAS CASES**

PIPELINE

TENTATIVE RULING:

The Motion of Plaintiffs for Clarification of the Settlement Class Definition is DENIED.

While Plaintiffs request that the class “definition” be amended, the substance of the motion effectively constitutes a request to alter the terms of the settlement agreement, to render an advisory opinion on the meaning of the agreement and its effect on pending and/or future litigation not subject of this action. The Court finds an amendment to the settlement agreement, without consent of all parties, is improper.

Here the parties have completed extensive settlement negotiations which resulted in a comprehensive, detailed settlement agreement. The fact that the parties now differ on the meaning of the language is not a matter for this Court to adjudicate here.